UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/670,911	09/24/2003	Elly Nedivi	01997/547002	6520

21559 7590 06/27/2006

CLARK & ELBING LLP
101 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER	
WEGERT, SANDRA L	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

DATE MAILED: 06/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/670,911	NEDIVI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sandra Wegert	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-58* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-7, drawn to a method of treating or preventing cell death in a subject by administering s-CPG15; classified in class 514, subclass 2+.

II. Claims 8-14, drawn to a method of treating or preventing cell death in a cell by administering s-CPG15; classified in class 435, subclass 7.1+.

III. Claims 15-20, drawn to a composition of matter comprising s-CPG15; classified in class 530, subclass 300+.

IV. Claims 21, 22, 32, 33 and 40, drawn to a method of treating undesirable cell survival in a subject by administering an antibody that binds s-CPG15; classified in class 424, subclass 130.1+.

V. Claims 23-30, 32 and 40, drawn to a method of treating undesirable cell survival in a subject by administering a nucleic acid; classified in class 514, subclass 44+.

VI. Claims 34-38 and 40, drawn to a method of enhancing cell death in a cell by administering a nucleic acid; classified in class 514, subclass 44+.

VII. Claims 31, 39 and 40, drawn to a method of enhancing cell death in a cell by administering a truncated CPG15; classified in class 530, subclass 300+.

VIII. Claim 41, drawn to a composition of matter comprising an antibody that binds s-CPG15; classified in class 530, subclass 300+.

IX. Claim 42, drawn to an inhibitory RNA; classified in class 536, subclass 23.5+.

X. Claims 43-49, drawn to recombinant methods of producing s-CPG15 and compositions of matter comprising nucleic acids; classified in class 435, subclass 69.1+.

XI. Claims 50-58, drawn to a method for identifying a compound that modulates cell death, survival or cellular differentiation by using s-CPG15; classified in class 435, subclass 7.1+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I, II, IV-VII, X and XI are directed to related methods. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the methods of Inventions I, II, IV-VII, X and XI are distinct, each from the other, related only in that they involve a CPG15 nucleic acid or polypeptide. The claimed nucleic acid binding assays and treatments, in vivo antibody or peptide treatments and detection assays all encompass different subjects (cultured cells versus animals), different conditions, different protocols, different personnel, and all have differing chances of success.

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for Inventive Groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably

distinct inventions for the following reasons: Groups III, VIII, IX and X are independent and distinct, each from the other, because their products possess characteristic differences in structure and function and each has an independent utility that is distinct for each invention which cannot be exchanged. The polypeptide of Group III can be used for treatment or can be used to make an antibody. The antibody of Group VIII can be used to localize the CPG polypeptide as well as for treatment. The siRNA of Group IX is used as an antagonist and does not encode a polypeptide. The nucleic acids produced in Group X can be used in gene therapy as well as to make the protein of Group I.

Invention I is related to Invention III as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the polypeptide can be used therapeutically or can be used to make an antibody.

Inventions I and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group VIII is neither used in nor produced by the method of Group I.

Inventions I and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the inhibitory RNA of Group IX is neither

used in nor produced by the method of Group I.

Invention II is related to Invention III as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the polypeptide can be used therapeutically or can be used to make an antibody.

Invention II is unrelated to Inventions VIII and IX. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group VIII and the RNA of Group IX is neither used in nor produced by any the methods of Group II.

Invention III is unrelated to inventions IV, V, VI, VIII and XI. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the peptide of Group III is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group IV.

Invention IV is related to Invention VIII as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the antibody can be used to localize the CPG polypeptide or can be used therapeutically.

Inventions IV and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the RNA of Group IX is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group IV.

Inventions V and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group VIII is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group V.

Invention V is related to Invention IX as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the RNA can be used to localize cells producing the CPG polypeptide or can be used therapeutically.

Inventions VI and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group VIII is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group VI.

Invention VI is related to Invention IX as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1)

the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05 (h)). In the instant case the RNA can be used to localize cells producing the CPG polypeptide or can be used therapeutically.

Inventions VII and VIII are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of Group VIII is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group VII.

Inventions VII and IX are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the RNA of Group IX is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group VII.

Inventions IX and XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together, or they have different modes of operation, or they have different functions, or they have different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the RNA of Group IX is neither used in nor produced by the methods of Group IV.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each group is unique, as well as by their different classifications, divergent

subject matter and different search requirements, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

In response to this requirement, applicants must elect from Groups I through XI. Applicant is advised that in order for the reply to this requirement to be complete it must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(i).

Notice of Rejoinder:

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Advisory information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sandra Wegert whose telephone number is (571) 272-0895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday - Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM (Eastern Time). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback, can be reached at (571) 272-0961.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For

more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SLW

18 June 2006

Eileen B. O'Hara

EILEEN B. O'HARA
PRIMARY EXAMINER